



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.01	EFFECTIVE DATE 05/03/2011	PAGE 1 of 7
APPROVED BY: <i>Robert Kay for</i> <i>Marvin J. Southard</i> Director	SUPERSEDES 606.1 10/01/1989	ORIGINAL ISSUE DATE 03/22/1988	DISTRIBUTION LEVEL(S) 1

PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide policy and guidelines regarding performance evaluations for Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health (LAC-DMH) employees.

DEFINITION

- 2.1 A performance evaluation is management's assessment of an employee's performance in relation to the requirements of the position the employee holds. It is a continuing day-to-day responsibility of supervision to evaluate the employee's performance in preparation for reporting to management. Performance evaluations can serve as an effective management tool to help ensure that the goals and objectives of the Department are met.

POLICY

- 3.1 Los Angeles County Civil Service Rules (CSR) require that all employees be formally evaluated at least once a year. Probationers also must be evaluated by the end of the probationary period.
- 3.2 In addition, County Ordinance and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) require that an evaluation of "Competent" or better be on file within the previous 12 months before an employee may receive any annual step increase.
- 3.3 The employee's immediate supervisor and Program Head or District/Division Chief have responsibility to ensure the timeliness and appropriateness of any performance evaluation that is due.
- 3.4 For overall "Improvement Needed" ratings and "Unsatisfactory" ratings, the DMH-Human Resources Bureau (DMH-HRB) shall also ensure the propriety of such ratings and take appropriate measures as required by CSR and Departmental policy.
- 3.5 Evaluations More Often Than Once A Year
Performance evaluations may be issued more often than once a year. Rating periods for such evaluations shall not overlap and should be contiguous.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	2 of 7

3.6 Leaves During Rating Periods

When an employee's leave of absence is of such length during the rating period that a proper assessment of the employee's performance in any factor cannot be made, the rater may note that fact in the Comments section of the evaluation and identify the period of the employee's leave. The overall rating may then be left blank and no ratings entered in any of the factors or items. In these cases, such evaluations result in the employee being deemed competent for the rating period.

RATINGS

4.1 There are five overall ratings that are used by the County for employees not under the Management Appraisal and Performance Plan. (See Attachment 1, Performance Evaluation Packet).

4.2 Each performance evaluation issued shall properly document one of the five overall ratings identified below:

4.2.1 Outstanding

All work performance is consistently above the standards of the position. A substantial part of the work performance exceeds supervisory and management expectations most of the time. Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate the rating.

4.2.2 Very Good

A substantial part of the work performance is well above the standards of performance required for the position, and all other parts of the performance are at least competent. Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate the rating.

4.2.3 Competent

The work performance is consistently up to or somewhat above the requirements of the position. This is the performance that is expected of a trained and qualified employee.

4.2.4 Improvement Needed

This rating indicates that (1) a significant part of the work performance is below the standards of performance required for the position and (2) it is reasonable to expect that the employee will bring the performance up to acceptable standards.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	3 of 7

- 4.2.4.1 A Plan for Improvement must be incorporated with an evaluation rating an employee overall "Improvement Needed." Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate this rating. Part of that substantiation is documentation that the employee was clearly informed of the deficiencies, what must be done to correct them, and that supervision/management has made reasonable efforts to assist the employee. It is not necessary to attach copies of conference memos, warnings, etc. to the evaluation as long as the Comments section documents the incidents, problems, and/or disciplinary actions.
- 4.2.4.2 Whenever this rating is given, a subsequent evaluation must be made within a six-month period unless the "Improvement Needed" follow-up period has been extended under provisions of CSR 20. It is not necessary in all circumstances for the entire six-month period to elapse before a final rating is issued.
- 4.2.4.3 The subsequent evaluation must either rate the employee overall "Unsatisfactory" or overall "Competent." Except when the follow-up period has been extended pursuant to CSR 20, if no final evaluation is submitted by the end of the six-month period, the employee reverts to his/her immediate prior status. The date that the employee is given or mailed the "Improvement Needed" rating begins the follow-up period.
- 4.2.4.4 Managers at the level of Program Head or above wishing to consider rating an employee overall "Improvement Needed" must contact the Performance Management Unit of the DMH-HRB for assistance as soon as possible, but not later than 60 days prior to the due date of the evaluation or anticipated issuance of such rating.
- 4.2.4.5 In those circumstances where a follow-up period needs to be extended as a result of an employee's absence from duties, the Program Head or District/Division Chief must contact the DMH-HRB as soon as possible but not later than 30 days prior to the end of the period.

4.2.5 Unsatisfactory

A substantial part of the work performance is inadequate and definitely inferior to the standards of performance required for the position; or when it can be reasonably anticipated that formally rating the employee "Improvement Needed" would not correct the deficiencies; or when the employee has failed to improve his/her performance in factors previously



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	4 of 7

rated "Improvement Needed." Factual evidence must be presented in writing to substantiate this rating. It is not necessary to attach various memos to the evaluation as long as the Comments section documents the incidents, problems, and/or disciplinary actions.

- 4.2.5.1 When this rating is given, it must be accompanied by a discharge or reduction in those cases in which the employee is still in service.
- 4.2.5.2 Managers at the level of Program Head or above wishing to consider rating an employee overall "Unsatisfactory" must contact the Performance Management Unit of the DMH-HRB for assistance as soon as possible but not later than 60 days prior to the due date of the evaluation.

4.3 Supporting Documentation

Supporting documentation may be attached to the evaluation as long as the Comments section substantiates the factor and overall ratings.

PERSONS AUTHORIZED TO SIGN AS "REPORTING OFFICERS"

5.1 Rater

Normally the employee's immediate supervisor will also be the Rater.

5.2 Reviewer

- 5.2.1 The Reviewer for "Competent" ratings should be the supervisor or manager, within the employee's chain of command, immediately above the Rater. In many Departmental operations, it will be the Program Head.
- 5.2.2 For all other ratings, the Reviewer should be the individual designated by the chart in Section 5.4.

5.3 Department Head

- 5.3.1 For overall ratings of "Outstanding," the Chief Deputy Director must approve and sign as the Department Head.
- 5.3.2 For overall ratings of "Very Good," the Deputy Director is authorized to sign such evaluations as Department Head.
- 5.3.3 For overall "Competent" ratings, the District or Division Chief is authorized to sign as Department Head.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	5 of 7

5.3.4 For overall ratings of “Improvement Needed” and “Unsatisfactory,” the Departmental Human Resources Manager, or designee, is authorized to sign as the Department Head.

5.4	<u>Overall Rating</u>	<u>Review Level</u>	<u>Department Head</u>
	Outstanding	Deputy Director	Chief Deputy Director
	Very Good	District/Division Chief	Deputy Director
	Competent	Program Head	District/Division Chief
	Improvement Needed	District/Division Chief	HR Manager/ Deputy Director
	Unsatisfactory	District/Division Chief	HR Manager/Deputy Director

5.4.1 In those circumstances where the Rater is also authorized to sign the evaluation as Reviewer or Department Head, the Reviewer’s signature is not necessary, and the next level of management may sign as the Department Head.

PROCEDURE

- 6.1 DMH-HRB will send Performance Evaluation due date reports on a monthly basis to management.
- 6.2 The evaluation is to be prepared by the employee’s immediate supervisor (Rater). If the employee had more than one supervisor during the rating period, the current supervisor is responsible for obtaining input from the prior supervision.
- 6.3 The Rater prepares a draft of the evaluation for discussion with his/her immediate supervisor; the Rater finalizes the draft and obtains the appropriate signatures.
- 6.4 Reviewing levels will need to approve and sign the final evaluation before it is presented to the employee.
- 6.5 The Rater meets with the employee to review the evaluation, discusses the employee’s performance strengths and weaknesses, and reviews other job-related matters.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	6 of 7

- 6.6 The employee's signature on the evaluation does not constitute agreement with any rating or comment. If the employee declines to sign the evaluation, the Rater is to note that fact on the evaluation and, if possible, have the refusal witnessed.
- 6.7 If the employee is unavailable for the meeting because he/she is on a leave of absence or has left LAC-DMH service, the Rater shall enter "Unavailable for Signature" in the space provided for the employee's signature. It is inappropriate to state the reason for the leave of absence. If the employee has been reassigned to another section of the Department and is not on leave, the employee is considered available.
- 6.8 The completed evaluation is distributed accordingly by the Rater or designee.
- 6.9 Civil Service Rule (CSR) 20.06 of the County Code provides that a copy of the completed Performance Evaluation shall be given to the employee within 20 calendar days of the date the evaluation is presented to the employee for signature. If the evaluation is mailed to the employee, the date and address of the mailing are entered in the appropriate boxes on the evaluation form.
- 6.10 If the evaluation is hand-served to the employee, the date of service is entered in the appropriate box on the evaluation form.
- 6.11 The copies of the completed and signed evaluation are distributed as follows:
- 6.11.1 Original copy – Official Personnel Folder
- 6.11.1.1 Under provisions of the various Memoranda of Understanding, Personnel Files article, documents such as Performance Evaluations may not be filed in an employee's personnel folder until the time within which the employee may file a grievance has expired (control date) or until the completion of any grievance.
- 6.11.1.2 If no grievance is filed by the control date, Performance Evaluation is filed in the Official Personnel Folder.
- 6.11.1.3 For overall ratings of "Unsatisfactory" and "Improvement Needed," the DMH-HRB will ensure that the evaluation is filed in the Official Personnel Folder at the appropriate time.
- 6.11.2 One copy to – Area records Filing subject to the ten (10)-business-day control for grievances.
- 6.11.3 One copy to – Employee in accordance with Civil Service Rule 20.06.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT	POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	606.01	05/03/2011	7 of 7

6.12 Managers or supervisors who have specific questions about evaluations for individual employees should contact the DMH-HRB.

AUTHORITY

Civil Service Rules
Memoranda of Understanding

ATTACHMENT (HYPERLINKED)

1. [Annual Performance Evaluation Packet](#)

RESPONSIBLE PARTY

LAC-DMH Human Resources Bureau